



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,688	12/28/2001	Thierry Brusseau	09669.008001	9251

22511 7590 10/28/2004

OSHA & MAY L.L.P.
1221 MCKINNEY STREET
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER

RUHL, DENNIS WILLIAM

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

3629

DATE MAILED: 10/28/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/936,688

Applicant(s)

BRUSSEAU, THIERRY

Examiner

Dennis Ruhl

Art Unit

3629

[Handwritten signature]

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- 1) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - 2) ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - 3) ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Art Unit: 3629

1. The examiner will address applicant's remarks at the end of this office action.

Currently claims 1-17 are pending.

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

DP
10/25/04 3. Claims ¹⁻¹⁷ are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ouimet (WO 97/37328) in view of Zeitman (WO 98/04080).

For claims 1,2,4,5,9,10,12,14,15,17, Ouimet discloses a method of managing the parking of vehicles. Ouimet discloses that the user of a parking space enters information concerning the parking of their vehicle (i.e. vehicle location information and parking time information) into a ticket machine 12. That information is sent to a central computer system (server) 16 and to mobile units 18. The fee for parking is determined based on the location and time information. A debit card or credit card can be used to pay the parking fee. With respect to the recitation of the ticket machine supplying "parking authorization control elements" this is interpreted to be the receipt that is printed for the user by the printer 34 of the ticket machine 12. The ticket machine 12 does print a receipt for the user. Not disclosed is that the user can send parking information to the server by mobile telephone and that the server would then send the parking information to the ticket machine. Zeitman discloses a parking management system that has a high level of user convenience. Zeitman discloses that the user can directly communicate with a central computer system (server system) by using their

Art Unit: 3629

mobile telephone and can provide the information such as vehicle space and time information by using their telephone. This would allow for more user convenience with respect to adding another way for the user to conduct the parking space use transaction. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to provide Ouimet with the ability to take user information by telephone as is disclosed by Zeitman. The user could then communicate with the server 16 directly by telephone and then the server would update the payment terminals and mobile units with new information. The ticket machine can then print a receipt. The examiner considers it obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art that the receipt would contain information such as the parking time, parking location, and amount paid for the parking. This is what a receipt is for (to identify what you paid for, when, and how much it was, etc.).

For claim 3, the receipt printed by the ticket machine is fully capable of being placed inside the vehicle. This is a recitation of the intended use of the printed ticket (receipt) and the prior art is fully capable of what is claimed.

With respect to claims 6,7,8, the location of the parking space can be a number, which satisfies what is claimed. It does not matter if the number is a space number, a vehicle number, etc.. A number is a number and the prior art discloses the taking of a number.

For claim 11, the receipt is a list of information as claimed.

For claim 13, the "electronic certificate" is considered to be any data sent from the server to the phone during the parking use transaction. This could be a receipt in

Art Unit: 3629

electronic form or any other data sent to the phone. The term "electronic certificate" is very broad language and can be almost anything.

With respect to claim 16, the account of the user (debit card account) is fully capable of being recharged by a prepaid scratchable card. A user can purchase a lottery ticket (with scratchable areas to show what you won if anything) and if they win any amount of money, that money could be deposited into the debit card account. The prior art is fully capable of what is claimed.

4. Applicant's arguments filed 10/1/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. With respect to the argument that Ouimet fails to disclose any kind of printing of a ticket, applicant is referred to the fact that the ticket machine of Ouimet has a printer for the printing of receipts. A receipt is a ticket with printed matter on the ticket. Ouimet discloses what is claimed with respect to this argument. With respect to the argument that Zeitman teaches away from using payment terminals as disclosed by Ouimet, this is found to be non-persuasive. The feature in Zeitman of allowing a user to send parking information to a computer server by mobile phone adds a level of convenience to the system of Ouimet and the argument that they are not combinable is non-persuasive. Both references disclose parking systems for the managing of parking spaces, both deal with user sent parking data to a computer system as claimed. Both references are from the same field of endeavor and deal with the same issues and are considered analogous art, which has been properly combined.

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dennis Ruhl whose telephone number is 703-308-2262. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John Weiss can be reached on 703-308-2702. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).


DENNIS RUHL
PRIMARY EXAMINER